

Remarks

Claims 1-9, 11-18, and 20-53 are pending in this application. Solely in an effort to expedite prosecution, claims 1, 2, 9, 13, 18, 22, 25, 26, 28-40, and 42-47 are currently amended. Claims 10 and 19 are cancelled. Claims 48-53 are newly added. No new subject matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks, allowance of all the claims pending in the application is requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5, 7-15 and 17-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bulfer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,175,858). Applicant traverses this rejection on the following basis.

Claim 1 recites, among other things, retrieving a report of messages that are pending from the selected ones of the plurality of individual messaging accounts. Independent claims 9, 18, 25, 28, 38-40, and 42-47 include similar recitations, among other things.

In an exemplary embodiment, a proxy server may access a plurality of mail servers to access a plurality of accounts associated with a user (see the Specification at page 6, lines 15-24). The proxy server may transmit to each of the mail servers a command to generate and transmit a list of pending messages from each of the individual servers (see the Specification at page 6, line 28-page 7, line 1). The lists of pending email messages from the various servers may be displayed to the user (see the Specification at page 7, lines 7-9). The user may then select which messages should be retrieved from the various accounts on the servers (see the Specification at page 7, lines 9-12).

In contrast, Bulfer appears to disclose a system that retrieves messages from a predefined list of messaging systems, stores the retrieved messages in a single message repository, and generates a notification for a user that new messages have been retrieved (see Bulfer at col. 1, lines 50-55). In the system described by Bulfer, the various messaging systems are polled at user preferred intervals (see Bulfer at col. 2, lines 25-28). During a polling session, an agent logs on to each messaging service

associated with a user, retrieves all new messages, deposits all of the new messages into a mail repository, and generates a notification for the user that new messages have been retrieved (see Bulford at col. 2, lines 44-47, and 55-57). In some embodiments, new messages may further be deleted within the messaging services after a copy of the message has been retrieved and stored in the single mail repository (see Bulford at col. 2, lines 58-60). Therefore, Bulford discloses an agent that generates a notification of new messages that have already been retrieved, but does not retrieve a report of messages that are pending from the selected ones of the plurality of individual messaging accounts. Additionally, the agent disclosed by Bulford generates a notification of new messages, but does not retrieve a report of messages that are pending. Pending messages may include both new messages and messages that are not new.

Accordingly, the rejection of these claims must be withdrawn. Claims 2-5, 7, 8, 11-15, 17, 20-24, 26, 27, 29-37, and 41 depend from and add additional features to independent claims 1, 9, 18, 25, 28, and 40. Therefore, claims 2-5, 7, 8, 11-15, 17, 20-24, 26, 27, 29-37, and 41 are allowable, by virtue of their dependency, as well as for the features that they add to the independent claims.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bulfer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,175,858) as applied to claims 1-5, 7-15 and 17-47 above. Applicant traverses this rejection on the following basis.

With respect to claims 6 and 16, the Examiner admits that Bulfer does not disclose using the POP standard to retrieve messages (see the Office Action at page 7, paragraph 18). The Examiner apparently takes Official Notice that POP standard was a well known protocol in the art, and asserts that modifying the disclosed system of Bulfer by including the use of the POP standard would have been obvious to improve the functionality of the system (see the Office Action at page 7, paragraph 18). Even if the Examiner's allegations with respect to the knowledge generally available at the time of invention, and the motivation for modifying Bulfer are accepted *arguendo*, the

rejection is still improper for failing to teach or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention. Claims 6 and 16 depend from claims 1 and 9, respectively, and therefore are patentable over Bulfer because Bulfer, both alone and as modified by the Examiner, does not teach or suggest retrieving a report of messages that are pending from the selected ones of the plurality of individual messaging accounts. Therefore the rejections of these claims must be withdrawn.

Newly Added Claims

Claims 48-53 are newly added. These claims depend from independent claims 1, 9, 18, 25, and 28, which are allowable for the reasons presented above. Therefore, claims 48-53 are allowable, by virtue of their dependency, as well as for the features that they add to the independent claims.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Dated: December 28, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Sean L. Ingram
Registration No.: 48,283
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP
1600 Tysons Blvd.
McLean, Virginia 22102
703-905-2000